



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HERMAN HIRT, ETYMOLOGIE DER NEUHOCH-DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE (im HANDBUCH DES DEUTSCHEN UNTERRICHTS AN HÖHEREN SCHULEN, ed, Adolph Matthias, iv, 2.) + München, 1909, pp. xv 404.

In this book one of the leading scholars in Indo-Germanic philology reviews the German vocabulary in its historical development. The words of the language are here considered, not as in dictionaries, by themselves, but in their relation to each other. The history of language is viewed above all as a part, and a very important part, of *Kulturgeschichte*. The method as well as the point of view lend to the work an unusual interest not only for students of German, but for all who are interested in linguistic study.

The scope of the work, as outlined in the introductory chapter, is certainly comprehensive. A complete survey of the vocabulary presupposes a complete collection of the material, and that is possible only for the present and needs constant revision. For older periods it is of prime importance to record the first literary appearance of a word, which, of course, is not coincident with its origin. Then the vocabulary of the dialects, of different social classes and occupations is to be reviewed. Petrified words, long since obsolete and unintelligible, preserved only as parts of compounds or proper names, are to be considered, and, last but not least, semasiology is to receive careful attention.

In the historical sketch of the science of etymology the author's Indo-Germanic proclivities are given full rein. For a book concerned with German the presentation of the comparative material is exceedingly copious; in the tables of comparative sounds, Keltic, Armenian, and even Albanian correspondences are duly recorded. The material relating to the difficult question of long Idg. nasals and liquids is presented in accordance with the author's well-known theories as formulated in his treatises on "Ablaut" and Greek Grammar. It is safe to say that the average student of German etymology will be able to make little use of all this wealth, but, in view of the fact that in most books on German and English etymology and historic grammar the comparative side is but poorly represented, or even misrepresented, no fault need be found with the author for his liberality in this respect.

In the review of the German vocabulary a strictly chronological method is not followed. As a preliminary the Germanic loan-words in Greek, Latin, Finnic, Lithuanian, Slavic and Romance are examined. The list of such words in French

alone is instructive and impressive; among them we find such common words as *bannir, banc, bannière, blanc, danser, dérober, flot, frais, garder, glisser, guerre, regretter, riche, sale*, etc. (p. 49-52). Germanic loan-words are found also in Modern Greek and the languages of the Balkan region, and show that Germanic influence was more widespread than historical records show.

Of the ultimate origin of words in any language nothing is known for certain. Many words, after being traced back to Idg. permit of no further explanation. Yet new words have arisen at all times, even in prehistoric periods. For many of the imitative words we can assert such a later origin with assurance, especially for words signifying movement or noise. Many of these words are not attested for the earliest periods, though that does not preclude their Idg. origin. Then new words have come in thru the language of children, the secret dialects, especially the rogues' language, and others (§ 67). The bulk of the vocabulary, however, is not of such origin; it is either Idg. or has been borrowed from other languages in historic periods.

Now, on the basis of Kluge's etymological dictionary an attempt is made to classify the German vocabulary as to its provenience. The first question that presents itself is: "How is the Idg. origin of a word determined?" In this connection the author gives a highly instructive discussion of the significance of the so-called Partial Equations or Correspondences (*Partielle Gleichungen*). When a word can be traced in only two or three Idg. dialects the cause is either kinship or borrowing. But the latter is possible only for dialects at one time or another geographically contiguous; as, for instance, for Keltic-Slavic-Germanic. Hence Germanic-Aryan correspondences argue for the Idg. origin of the word in question, and the number of such correspondences is very considerable, nearly equal to those of Germanic to Keltic or Slavic.

Hirt gives lists of partial equations (§§ 82-85) which are remarkably equal in point of numbers and furnish no support to the long-cherished theory of the nearer kinship of Germanic with either Keltic or Slavic. Of course, the lists are not complete; they also contain some doubtful material. Thus under Germanic-Aryan I find Gothic *biniuhsian*=Skt. *nakṣati*, and under Germanic-Slavic the same word is quoted=Russian *njuchati*. Not one of these equations is certain. Feist in his "Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache" (p. 51) does not even mention the former; the latter he regards as doubtful. What Ablaut-relation is there between Skt. *nakṣati* and a root **neuks* which underlies the Gothic word? Again, the Old Norse *hrekja* is quoted under Germanic-Keltic as ==

Old Irish *crecht* "wound," but also under Germanic-Aryan as = Skt. *karjati* "he torments."

Now, in view of what is known of the wealth of synonyms in a primitive language, and of the processes by which, as civilization advances, a selection is made from this embarrassing wealth, it is easy to understand how an Idg. word may have survived in only one Idg. language, or even in only one dialect of that language. Thus of all the Germanic dialects at present German alone has the word "Schwager," which is nevertheless Idg. on account of Skt. *svásuras*. Hence, words that cannot be traced outside of the Germanic may yet be Idg., e. g., *Brust* (Engl. *breast*, Ablaut *u: eu*), *Winter*, *Hand*. In fact, the author denies any special significance to the partial equations and even goes so far as to say (§ 86): "Sobald wir also ein Wort des Germanischen in einer anderen indogermanischen Sprache nachgewiesen haben, so spricht alle Wahrscheinlichkeit dafür, dass es indogermanisch war." Compare with this the more cautious attitude of another well-known Indo-Germanic scholar, Meillet, in his "Introduction à l'Etude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes, Paris, 1908," p. 345: "Les rapprochements qui ne s'étendent pas à plus de deux dialectes doivent être tenus pour plus ou moins suspects, sauf raisons particulières, etc." And again, p. 346: "Là où il n'existe pas de raisons spéciales, on doit, en bonne méthode, tenir pour douteux tout rapprochement de mots qui ne porte que sur deux dialectes, etc." But then Hirt has little faith in the theory that makes the Germanic tribes neighbors of Slavs or Kelts in prehistoric times (cf. p. 63).

Passing over a number of chapters in which derivation and composition, the foreign elements in the vocabulary and their assimilation are considered, we come to Chapter IX, where a survey of the vocabulary from another point of view is attempted. Words are arranged in concept-groups and each group is examined as to its provenience. Some groups show much Idg. material, others little. Thus the numerals are overwhelmingly Idg., but the word for a thousand is specifically Germanic. To take one group for illustration, the words denoting parts of the human body are largely Idg.; yet many of the most common words in this group cannot be traced outside of Germanic, e. g., *Bein*, *Bauch*, *Blut*, *Brust*, *Busen*, *Finger*, *Haar*, *Hand*, *Klaue*, *Knochen*, *Leiche*, *Lunge* (a Germanic new formation), *Magen*, *Maul*, *Schädel*, *Schulter*, *Wade*, *Wange*, *Zagel* (= Eng. *tail*). The etymology of *Auge* is uncertain. All these words are old, common Germanic, many of them, no doubt, Idg. Loan-words in this group are few, e. g., *Kopf*, *Muskel*, *Nerv*. From an examination of the material under each group the author invariably draws conclusions for Idg. civilization. Thus from

the copious Idg. terminology for parts of the body it may be inferred that the Indo-Germani ate animals and dissected them. From the fact that the names of the chief domestic animals as well as such words as *Rahm*, *Herde* are Idg. it follows that the Indo-Germani were not Nomads. On the basis of the vocabulary for trees and plants the older view that the Indo-Germani were agriculturists is accepted against the Nomad-theory in vogue since Hehn and Schrader (§ 129). And so for each concept-group, minerals, natural phenomena, relations of family and state, qualities, activities, etc. the old Idg. material is sifted from what has been borrowed and interesting conclusions are drawn for the history of civilization. The method that aims to get from the word to the thing itself is rigorously applied with splendid results.

The material thus far examined is largely prehistoric and a precise account of its development is not possible. This becomes possible only for the time when written records appear and the remaining chapters are devoted to the task of giving a historic survey of the vocabulary for the historic periods. How words arise and vanish, become obsolete or die out, how in many cases they are revived, how the usage of words varies according to sex, age, territory and occupation, how the vocabulary of the *Schriftsprache* differs from and is influenced by that of the dialects and *Sondersprachen*, how cultural conditions and tendencies are reflected in language,—all this makes fascinating and instructive reading and is set forth with clearness and scholarly accuracy. But space forbids giving details; special attention, however, is due to the two final chapters on proper names and changes of meaning.

The explanation of proper names is one of the most difficult tasks of etymology. While some names or parts of names are readily explicable, the great mass is not clear. The Germanic personal names, like the Idg., are compounds consisting of two word-stems, like *Dietrich* < *diot* + *rich*. An examination of German names in use today reveals the fact that the greater part of them are old Germanic. Besides these we have the names of religious origin, names designating geographical provenience like *Sempacher*, *ten Brink*, *Vogtländer*, *Westermann*, surnames, particularly nicknames like *Lange*, *Kurze*, *Bidermann*, *Holbein*, *Kaiser*, *Zorn*. Sometimes sentences are contracted into a name, e. g., *Habeniet*, *Anesorge*. Position or occupation produces names like *Kamerer*, *Werter*, *Müller*, *Kästner*. Among names of foreign origin Slavic names are conspicuous, e. g., *Schwerin*, *Flotow*, *Kretschmar*. Jewish names are in great part of recent coinage, hence of an artificial, often bizarre character, e. g., *Lilienthal*, *Cohnstein*, *Rosenberg*, etc. The forms of proper names also show dialectic variations, thus diminutives

in *-ke* are prevailingly North-East German, those in *-el, lein, le*, Upper or Middle German.

Tribal names are far more difficult to explain than personal names, and opinions of scholars have diverged considerably. Thus Much interpreted most of these names as nicknames or animal-designations. Hirt does not accept these results and denies the validity of Much's method. What he submits is tentative, but deserving of careful consideration. It is undeniable that many Germanic names are Idg. and hence defy further etymological explanation. On the strength of the so-called "Elliptic Dual" in Idg. (Castores = Castor and Pollux, Latin plural having replaced the Dual) Hirt assumes that the tribal names are plurals of personal names, the method of formation for both kinds being the same. Furthermore, both are often identical in part. Now, if the etymology of many personal names is hopeless, still oftener is this the case with tribal names, and most of the etymologies that have been advanced for them are little better than guesses. Thus, to take a conspicuous example, the etymology of *Germani* is still utterly unknown. The author believes that the name originally belonged to one tribe and was subsequently generalized in its application.

As for place-names, there is much repetition in different localities. Names of rivers are especially interesting. Many such names assumed as Keltic occur in such distribution as to argue for pre-Keltic, possibly, as Hirt doubtfully suggests, for Ligurian origin. After allowing for these as well as for undoubted Slavic names, the number of rivers bearing genuine Germanic names is small, *Elbe, Fulda, Weser, Oder*, and the etymology of these names is uncertain. At least, Hirt regards Müllenhoff's explanation as very doubtful. A thorough investigation of the material is necessary before reliable results can be reached.

The chapter on semasiology concludes the book. To trace the meaning of a word back to prehistoric times involves much conjecturing, and imagination often takes the place of information. The attempt which Hirt makes to trace the original meaning of *Ding* is instructive in this respect (p. 345). Gothic *þeihs*, O. H. G. *ding* point to an Id. **ténkos* or **tenkós*. Kinship with Latin *tempus* is more than doubtful, and the comparison with Skt. *ā-tanakti* "to congeal," Lith. *tánkus*, "thick, close," is not at all convincing. To explain the original meaning of *Ding* on such grounds as "a condition of being close together," whence develop the meanings of "crowd," "assembly," is ingenious, but that is all. But the demand which Hirt makes, following Meringer, that to get at the fundamental meaning of a word we must start with a definite concrete, not

with a general abstract meaning, is thoroughly sound and, if obeyed, would do away with much of the fanciful speculation that is a hindrance to philological research.

That changes of meaning like sound-changes are subject to law seems certain, but the laws are difficult to detect and hence a principle of classification is not easily established. A historical principle is no doubt preferable to one purely logical, but owing to the immense diversity of historical details, the logical principle is more practicable. So Hirt classifies changes of meaning broadly, according to (a) whether the meaning remains within the same concept-sphere and merely becomes narrower or wider, better or worse, e. g., O. H. G. *thiorna*, N. H. G. *Dirne*, or (b) whether there is a transference to another concept-sphere by metaphor or metonymy, e. g., *Seezunge*, *Frauenzimmer*, *Dukat*. As for the causes of such change, they are found in the varying signification of the same word according to its syntactic use in the sentence; the different meanings of "*Tisch*" are an illustration (p. 367). The causes of change of meaning can only be explained by considering the function of the word in the sentence, not by studying the word by itself.

The carefully constructed indices at the end of the volume are an invaluable help to the student. The value of the book, however, lies not merely in the material which it contains, but in the clear and lucid manner in which the great problems of etymology are presented and discussed. A careful and conscientious study of this work of one of the foremost exponents of philological science of the present day is in itself a training in philological method.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Columbia University.

DIE ROLLE DES ERZÄHLERS IN DER EPIK von Dr. Käte Friedemann. Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, herausgegeben von Professor Dr. Oskar F. Walzel. Neue Folge, 7. Heft. H. Haessel Verlag Leipzig 1910. X, 246.

Was ist das wesentlichste Gesetz aller echt epischen Darstellungsweise? Antwort: Die Selbstdarstellung des Erzählers!—da wäre der Kern der Arbeit. Sie erstreckt sich über 252 Seiten, wovon 7 auf das Vorwort, 32 auf die Einleitung, 64 auf den ersten größeren Abschnitt: den Blickpunkt des Erzählers, 146 auf den zweiten größeren Abschnitt: die epische Darstellung im Einzelnen, und 3 Seiten auf das Schlußwort kommen.